

**MINUTES OF THE  
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SEPTEMBER 6, 2005**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on September 6, 2005 at 7:12 p.m. by Chairman Smith in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Merz, Powers, Thompson, S. White, Chrm. Smith

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Will Wong, Community Development Director; Reg Murray, Senior Planner; Steve Geiger, Associate Planner; Janet Ferro, Administrative Assistant

**ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER**

**ITEM II: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of August 2, 2005 were approved as submitted.

**ITEM III: PUBLIC COMMENT**

Keith Nesbitt, Auburn City Councilman, read a letter from Sheri Krueger, who is working on Auburn's Pedestrian Walkability Program. The letter suggested possible improvements to a short walking trail adjacent to the Rite Aid store parking lot, 420 Grass Valley Highway, and noted the possibility of continuing the trail through the parking lot. (Improvements to this location are part of Item IV A, originally scheduled for tonight's public hearing.)

**ITEM IV: PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- A. **Civic Design Extension – 420 Grass Valley Highway (Rite Aide) – File CD 05-2.** The applicant requests approval of a Design Review Permit for improvements to the Rite Aid site at 420 Grass Valley Highway. Improvements include a new driveway onto Hwy 49,

parking lot and site landscaping, and a renovation of the building façade. *THIS ITEM IS BEING CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2005.*

- B. Civic Design, Tree Permit and Variance – 12852 Earhart Avenue (Sierra West Industrial Center) – File CD 04-4; TP 04-16; VA 04-10.** The applicant requests approval of a Civic Design, Tree Permit, and Variance to construct the Sierra West Industrial Center in the Auburn Airport Industrial Park (AAIP). The 34,380 square foot industrial office development includes three buildings ranging in size from 9,600 square feet to 15,180 square feet as well as related site improvements such as parking and landscaping.

Reg Murray gave the staff report. He described the parcel and reviewed the proposal for the Commission. He noted that the primary building material of all three buildings proposed is sandstone-colored metal, and airport design standards discourage the use of metal without complimentary facade. The applicant is proposing veneer wainscoting on the north side elevations of all three buildings and a cement plaster finish on the north elevation of Building A. Staff believes that further enhancements to the buildings should be provided to comply with the AAIP development standards, specifically that the wainscot treatment and cement plaster finish should be incorporated on all of the building elevations with greater exposure to the public, and architectural entry features included for each building entry. He outlined staff's recommendations in this regard and also reviewed the potential impacts of this construction to trees on the property. He reviewed the Tree Permit information and added that the applicant had not prepared an arborist report as required by the Tree Ordinance.

Chrm. Smith noted the beautiful trees on the property and stated that he felt the item should be continued until the arborist report has been received.

Wray Crawford, project applicant, advised that the project was designed to save as many trees as possible given limitations because of the size and configuration of the lot. There was discussion of the trees on the property that would remain and how they could be affected by this construction.

Crawford then noted his disagreement with Conditions 6 A & B that would require the wainscot plaster finish planned for the north

elevation of Building A to be included on all building elevations with greater exposure to the public, and also architectural entry features for each building entry. He feels this requirement is excessive, and pointed out the odd shape of this remnant property and the fact that most of these elevations are barely visible from the street. He stated that each entry has features of glass doors, stone veneer and awnings, and the architectural requirement could hold back the utility of the building as he did not know who would occupy the space when leased or how many entrances would ultimately be used. He stated that he believes his project is being held to a higher standard than previously constructed buildings in the Airport Industrial Park and noted examples. He added that this requirement could make the project financially unfeasible and requested the removal of Condition 6 A & B.

Chrm. Smith stated that he still would like to see an arborist report and section drawings showing what will happen around the trees. He understands the applicant's concern about stucco on the west side of the long building and he would like more time to think about this requirement, and he also would prefer that the Commission review the arborist report, not just staff.

Chrm. Smith assumed a motion for discussion and **MOVED** to continue this item until the arborist report has been received, also giving the Commissioners more time to review other buildings in the area before making a decision as to whether the requirement for additional stucco and entry features should be upheld.

There was further discussion of the Commissioners' alternatives with regard to the stucco requirements and arborist information. The Commission decided to continue the project to the September 20, 2005 meeting.

The vote on the motion to continue:

AYES:	Merz, S. White, Chrm. Smith
NOES:	Powers, Thompson
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

The motion was approved.

The Chairman announced the 10-day appeal period.

**ITEM V: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
FOLLOW-UP REPORTS**

**A. City Council Meetings**

Director Wong reported on recent City Council meetings.

**B. Future Planning Commission Meetings**

Director Wong advised the Commission of items that would be coming before them.

**C. Reports**

None.

**ITEM VI: PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS**

None.

**ITEM VII: FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS**

None.

**ITEM VIII: ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Elaine Ferro, Administrative Assistant